UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,546	03/02/2009	Marcin Krotkiewski	1914	5814
20676 ALFRED J MA	7590 03/14/201 NGELS	1	EXAMINER	
4729 CORNEL	L ROAD		HOFFMAN, SUSAN COE	
CINCINNATI, OH 452412433			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1655	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/14/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Astion Comments	10/585,546	KROTKIEWSKI, MARCIN		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Susan Hoffman	1655		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) ■ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ja 2a) ■ This action is FINAL . 2b) ■ This 3) ■ Since this application is in condition for allowal closed in accordance with the practice under E	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,9-16 and 18 is/are 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,5-8 and 17 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	withdrawn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) \square objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) D Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
2) Notice of Preferences Cried (PTO-932) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/585,546 Page 2

Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed January 14, 2011 has been received and entered. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code, not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action. Any rejection set forth in a previous Office action that is not specifically set forth below is withdrawn.

- 2. Claims 1-18 are pending.
- 3. In the reply filed on August 16, 2010, applicant elected Group I, claims 1-8 and 17 and the extraction of claim 3 for the species with traverse.
- 4. Claims 4, 9-16 and 18 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.
- 5. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 17 are examined on the merits.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities: "catechins" is misspelled as "catachins". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 is indefinite because it is unclear what metabolic rates are encompassed by "low" metabolic rates.

Application/Control Number: 10/585,546 Page 3

Art Unit: 1655

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liao (US 6,610,749), Majeed (US 5,804,596), Gow (US 7,279,184), de la Harpe (US 6,251,888), and BE 1009545 for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action.

All of applicant's arguments regarding this ground of rejection have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that none of the references teach a Coleus forskohlii extract containing at least 10% by weight of diterpene forskohlin as recited in claim 1. However, Majeed specifically teaches a composition comprising forskohlin extracted from C. forskohlii. The extract can contain from about 15% to 100% forskohlin (see column 6, lines16-27). Forskohlin is a type of diterpene. Thus, Majeed is considered to teach a C. forskohlii extract with at least 10% by weight of diterpene forskohlin.

Applicant also argues that the claimed invention is patentable over the prior art because Figures 2A and 2B show that the composition produces synergistic results. Applicant argues that Figure 2A shows that each individual ingredient results in an increase in body weight from 42 to 46% while the results for the combined ingredients show an increase of 32%. Applicant also argues that Figure 2B shows that each individual ingredient results in a 71 to 79% change in body weight while the results for the combined ingredients show a change of 60%. Applicant states that these results show that the claimed composition produces synergistic results. However, applicant has not supported the assertion that these results are synergistic rather than additive (see MPEP section 716.02 (a)). An artisan of ordinary skill would clearly expect a combination of five weight loss ingredients to function in an increased manner in comparison with one weight loss ingredient. Thus, the showing that the combination of the five ingredients

Application/Control Number: 10/585,546

Art Unit: 1655

Page 4

functions better than the single ingredient is not considered to be unexpected. In addition, the results shown in Figures 2A and 2B are not considered to be commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. This is because the results are only shown for one formulation that falls within the claimed percentages while the claims encompass numerous other embodiments that are not used to produce the experimental data (see MPEP section 716.02 (d)).

In addition, applicant argues that "There is no basis for concluding predictability where a composition includes five different constituents, each present in the composition in specific and varying amounts...each of which is mentioned in a different reference..." because it would require limitless numbers of optimizations to arrive that the claimed compositions. However, the cited prior art specifically teaches that each of the claimed ingredients was known in the art at the time of the invention to be useful to treat obesity. The fact that the claimed ingredients might be among numerous other agents suitable for treating obesity does not negate the cited references' explicit teachings suggesting that the claimed ingredients would have been useful for that treatment. The fact that the combination is one of a number of obvious combinations of obesity treatments does not make it any less obvious. Thus, the combination of the prior art is considered to properly teach combining the claimed ingredients together into a single composition. In addition, in regards to the amounts of each ingredient in the composition, . "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). The references teach that each of the claimed ingredients is a pharmaceutically active ingredient. An artisan of ordinary skill would routinely

Art Unit: 1655

modify the amount of pharmaceutically active ingredients based on the patient's age, weight, gender, and condition.

9. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liao (US 6,610,749), Majeed (US 5,804,596), Gow (US 7,279,184), de la Harpe (US 6,251,888), and BE 1009545 as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 17 above, and further in view of Chokshi (US 2003/0059403) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office action.

Applicant does not set forth any specific arguments regarding this rejection. Thus, this rejection is considered valid for the reasons discussed above and in the previous Office action.

10. No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/585,546 Page 6

Art Unit: 1655

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Hoffman whose telephone number is (571)272-0963. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susan Hoffman/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655